

FRANKLIN GRAY PATENTS, LLC
ROBERT H. FRANTZ, REGISTERED US PATENT AGENT

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSIONRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 24 2006

TO: Examiner Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
GAU 2635
Fax: 571-273-8300 (Central Fax Server)

FROM: Robert H. Frantz
Franklin Gray Patents, LLC
Tel: 405-812-5613
Fax: 405-440-2465

DATE: February 24, 2006

PAGES: 10 (inclusive)

In re the Application of:

Viktors Berstis)

Serial Number: 10/015,492)

Group: 2625

Docket Number: AUS920011012US1)

Examiner: Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor

Filed on: 12/13/2001)

For: "System and Method for Anti-Moiré)
Imaging in a Two Dimensional Sensor
Array"**Certificate of Transmission under 37 CFR §1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on:

DATE: Feb. 24, 2006 SIGNATURE: / Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553

NOTICE:

The information contained in this facsimile transmission is confidential. If you have received this transmission in error, please contact the sender immediately and destroy your copy.

P.O. Box 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123-2334
TEL.: 405-812-5613 FAX: 405-440-2465
RFRANTZ@FRANKLINGRAY.COM WWW.FRANKLINGRAY.COM

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office***Identification Page per MPEP 1208 (I) (A)*****RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
FEB 24 2006**

In re the Application of:

Viktors Berstis)	
Serial Number: 10/015,492)	Group: 2625
Docket Number: AUS920011012US1)	Examiner: Sathyanaraya V. Perungavoor
Filed on: 12/13/2001)	
For: "System and Method for Anti-Moiré)	
Imaging in a Two Dimensional Sensor)	
Array")	

REPLY BRIEF***Real Party in Interest per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(i)***

The subject patent application is owned by International Business Machines Corporation of Armonk, NY.

Related Appeals and Interferences per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ii)

The present patent application is related to US Patent Application number 10/015,880, docket number AUS920011011US1, which is under appeal from final rejections. No decision from a court or the Board has been rendered in this related appeal.

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 2 of 9

Status of Claims Page per MPEP 1208 (I) (B)***Status of Claims per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(iii)***

Claims 1 - 19 were finally rejected in the Examiner's decision of May 16, 2005. Claims 1, 7, 9, and 12 were amended on February 3, 2005. Claims originally filed numbered as 16 - 20 were renumbered to 15- 19 by the examiner, as no claim number 15 was originally presented.

The rejections of Claims 1 - 19 were appealed by Appellant on September 16, 2006.

Status of Amendments after Final Rejections per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(iv)

No amendments to the claims have been submitted or entered after final rejections.

Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(v)

Please refer to the Appeal Brief filed October 12, 2005, for a Summary of the Claimed Subject Matter.

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 3 of 9

Grounds for Rejection Page per MPEP 1208 (I) (C)***Grounds for Rejection For Which Review is Sought per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(vi)***

Appellant requests review by the Board of the rejections of claims 1 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 4,574,311 to Resnikoff, *et al.* (hereinafter "Resnikoff") in view of publication "Lfsr Counters Implement Binary Polynomial Generators" by Balph (hereinafter "Balph").

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 4 of 9

Arguments Page per MPEP 1208 (I) (D)***Arguments per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(vii)***

Please refer to Appellant's original arguments in the Appeal Brief filed October 12, 2005, which are maintained by Appellant.

Appellant's Reply to Examiner's Answer

In the Examiner's Answer regarding the Claims Appendix as set forth in the Appeal Brief, it was stated that claims 18 and 19 contained errors for depending upon claim 18, and that these claims should both depend from claim 17. Appellant agrees.

In the Examiner's Answer, "supplementary evidence" is introduced as "evidence NOT used in the rejections", which is an improper citation of references. The listed non-patent literature is presented in support of Examiner's argument, and thus it is "used". If newly cited art is cumulative to the art of record, then perhaps it is 'not relied upon', but in such a situation, the Examiner's argument should be able to stand without the newly cited art. Therefore, Appellant responds to the newly cited art in the following paragraphs as if it were relied upon for the rejection.

In the Examiner's Answer, it was stated that Resnikoff and Balph need not be in the same field of endeavor, but that they only must be pertinent to the particular problem to which the applicant was concerned, as held in *In re Oetiker*. It was stated that Resnikoff, Balph, and the applicant were all concerned with the problem of "number generation."

This is an over simplification or extremely broad view of the subject matters of the three documents, where Resnikoff clearly relied upon a probabilistic numbering process, which is distinctly different from a deterministic numbering process. It is unreasonable to expect that one skilled in the art would answer the question "What is relevant or pertinent to generating numbers in a *deterministic* manner?" with the answer "A good Poisson *probability* function". Thus, there is no relevance, or pertinence, between Balph and Resnikoff.

It was also stated in the Examiner's Answer that differences between probabilistic and deterministic functions are 'not of importance to the instant invention' or to the combination of

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 5 of 9

Resnikoff and Balph, that this is 'simply substitution' of one number generator for another. It is not clear upon what mathematical principle this assertion is based. The functions and results of deterministic functions and probabilistic functions are very different, as shown by the extrinsic evidence of the definitions of the terms provided in the Appeal Brief that the two concepts are contrasted to each other. Appellant contends that deterministic processes and probabilistic processes are rarely, if ever, suitable for substitution for each other. For example, it is preferable to ride in an aircraft for which the fuel tanks were filled with a *deterministic* amount of fuel, not an aircraft filled with a *probable* amount of fuel. In an opposite example, it is preferable to play a game using dice which are of a design to yield equally *probable* results, not to play with a set of dice which are "loaded" so as to produce a predictable *deterministic* result. No evidence supporting the substitutability of these functions has been provided. Thus the holding is improper as the position is merely opinion of the Examiner, which should be afforded less weight than the actual extrinsic definitions provided by Appellant.

It was also stated in the Examiner's Answer that applicant had provided only a "vague suggestion of non-substitutability" in the Appeal Brief, but had not indicated its criticality in the disclosure. Appellant by law is required in a patent disclosure only to disclose what the invention *is*, and there is no legal basis for requiring an applicant to declare what an invention *is not*, or *should not be*. Otherwise, the requirement to disclose a preferred embodiment would be accompanied by a requirement to disclose a "nonpreferred" embodiment, which is certainly not true. Additionally, to imply that an applicant must preclude *in advance* all items in a disclosure which may later in an Examiner's opinion be considered substitutable elements, steps, and limits, would set an impossible bar to meet. Applicant has met the requirement of a disclosure by setting forth an operable, preferable embodiment.

It was stated in the Examiner's Answer that use of LFSR's is well known to reduce logic, and two additional references were cited showing such statements. However, this now places *three* such LFSR documents in the prosecution history, none of which suggest that an LFSR random number generator is a good substitution for a Poisson or another probabilistic function. As such, the addition of the two LFSR references tilts the preponderance of evidence towards the favor of Appellant's argument that deterministic functions and probabilistic functions are not substitutable for each other, and thus it would not have been obvious to make such a substitution.

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 6 of 9

For these reasons, Appellant maintains that the rejections of claims 1 - 19 under 37 USC §103 over Resnikoff in view of Balph is improper as a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been properly established, wherein the references are not taken from the same fields of endeavor and they are not pertinent to each other, and whereas there is no motivation or suggestion provided by either reference to substitute a probabilistic pixel placement process with a deterministic pixel placement process.

Summary of Arguments

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the rejections of Claims 1 - 19 were erroneous, and Appellant requests reversal of the rejections.

Respectfully,

/ Robert Frantz /

Robert H. Frantz, Reg. No. 42,553
Agent for Applicant(s)
Tel: (405) 812-5613

Franklin Gray Patents, LLC
P.O. Box 23324
Oklahoma City, OK 73127
Tel: 405-812-5613
Fax: 405-440-2465

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 7 of 9

Claims Appendix

per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(viii)

Clean Form of Amended Claims

Please refer to the Appeal Brief filed October 12, 2005, for a copy of the claims in clean form.

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 8 of 9

Evidence Appendix
per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ix)

No evidence has been submitted by applicant or examiner pursuant to 37 CFR §§1.130, 1.131, or 1.132.

Serial No. 10/015,492

Viktors Berstis

Page 9 of 9

Related Proceedings Appendix

per 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(x)

No decisions have been rendered by a court or the Board in the related proceedings as identified under 37 CFR §41.37(c)(1)(ii).